

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100%; height: 100%;"></div>		Date of mailing (day/month/year)
Applicant's or agent's file reference JHTK-109-PCT		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/000344	International filing date (day/month/year) 14.01.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 15.01.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant HITACHI CHEMICAL CO., LTD.		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000344

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language

_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐

a sequence listing

☐

table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐

in written format

☐

in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐

contained in the international application as filed.

☐

filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐

furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000344

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-6	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-6	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-6	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2003-187620, A (Alps Electric Co., Ltd.), 4 July, 2003 (04.07.03), full text, Figs. 1 and 4</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 7-225320, A (Enplas Corp.), 22 August, 1995 (22.08.95), full text, all drawings</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 10-68947, A (Matsushita Electric Works, Ltd.), 10 March, 1998 (10.03.98), full text, all drawings</p> <p>Claims 1, 4 and 5</p> <p>The subject matters of claims 1, 4 and 5 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 1, particularly in Fig. 1, describes a constitution where a light-guide plate 12 and a reflector 15 are provided on the back side of a liquid-crystal display device 20, with a reflecting element 12C provided in the light-guide plate. In view of Fig. 4 in the said document, it suggests that the top of a reflector 15 is flat in its sectional shape. Accordingly it is not found that the trapezoidal section of a reflector is not a particular feature.</p> <p>Claims 2 and 6</p> <p>The subject matters of claims 2 and 6 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 2, particularly in paragraph [0002], suggests that a diffusion patten is formed on the reflector-side of a light-guide plate, and, in Fig. 1, that the heights in section of the prism elements of a reflector are the same.</p> <p>Accordingly the subject matters of claim 2 and 6 could have been easily conceived by applying the invention described in document 2 to that in document 1.</p> <p>Claim 3</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 3 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 3 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 3 describes a feature where the heights in section of reflecting elements provided on the back side of a light-guide plate vary.</p> <p>Accordingly the subject matter of claim 3 could have been easily conceived by applying the invention described in document 3 to that in document 1.</p>			

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

JHTK-109-PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000344

International filing date (day/month/year)

14.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

15.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

HITACHI CHEMICAL CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000344

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000344

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1 - 6	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1 - 6	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1 - 6	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>Document 1: JP, 2003-187620, A (Alps Electric Co., Ltd.), 4 July, 2003 (04.07.03), full text, Figs. 1 and 4</p> <p>Document 2: JP, 7-225320, A (Enplas Corp.), 22 August, 1995 (22.08.95), full text, all drawings</p> <p>Document 3: JP, 10-68947, A (Matsushita Electric Works, Ltd.), 10 March, 1998 (10.03.98), full text, all drawings</p> <p>Claims 1, 4 and 5</p> <p>The subject matters of claims 1, 4 and 5 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 1, particularly in Fig. 1, describes a constitution where a light-guide plate 12 and a reflector 15 are provided on the back side of a liquid-crystal display device 20, with a reflecting element 12C provided in the light-guide plate. In view of Fig. 4 in the said document, it suggests that the top of a reflector 15 is flat in its sectional shape. Accordingly it is not found that the trapezoidal section of a reflector is not a particular feature.</p> <p>Claims 2 and 6</p> <p>The subject matters of claims 2 and 6 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 2, particularly in paragraph [0002], suggests that a diffusion patten is formed on the reflector-side of a light-guide plate, and, in Fig. 1, that the heights in section of the prism elements of a reflector are the same.</p> <p>Accordingly the subject matters of claim 2 and 6 could have been easily conceived by applying the invention described in document 2 to that in document 1.</p> <p>Claim 3</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 3 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 3 cited in the ISR.</p> <p>Document 3 describes a feature where the heights in section of reflecting elements provided on the back side of a light-guide plate vary.</p> <p>Accordingly the subject matter of claim 3 could have been easily conceived by applying the invention described in document 3 to that in document 1.</p>			